

THE REMARKS CANVASSED

IN REPLY TO A

RECENT PUBLICATION

OF THE

REV. JACOB STANLEY,

ENTITLED

“REMARKS” &c.

BY THE AUTHOR OF

“TOTAL ABSTINENCE VERSUS MODERATION.”

“Its office is that of a pioneer—to remove obstructions out of the way that the Gospel may have free course ; by no means is it intended, as some have supposed to supercede, but rather to make way for that all important means of the salvation of man.”—*Address of the Committee of the Bristol Total Abstinence Society.*

“If thy hand or thy foot offend thee, *cut them off, and cast them from thee*;—and if thine eye offend thee, *pluck it out, and cast it from thee.*”—Matthew viii. 8—9.

LONDON:

J. PASCO, 12, PATERNOSTER ROW, & J. MASON, 14, CITY ROAD:

LYNN:—JOHN THEW, BOOKSELLER.

293

Har

AC

901

.A1

no. 502

29.4

NOTICE

Of the Author's Pamphlet entitled "TOTAL ABSTINENCE *versus* MODERATION," taken from the "British and Foreign Temperance Intelligencer" and applicable to the present work.

We have on our table a few pages of a pamphlet about to be published in the East Riding of Yorkshire, entitled, "ABSTINENCE *versus* MODERATION:—by a Methodist Water-drinker;"—who is, if we are rightly informed, an Itinerant brother to the Rev. J. Stanley, to whose "calm considerations" he replies. This writer does not take up the position "that it is unscriptural, and consequently sinful, to touch at all, inebriating drinks." "But," he says, "the question with me is, whether on the supposition of a dietetical use, I ought not to forego altogether, even a *sinless* practice of *moderate* drinking, if by such means I may induce others to abandon a *sinful* practice of *immoderate* drinking, prevailing on them, *by my example*, to abstain altogether from intoxicating drinks, a remedy which Mr. Stanley repeatedly admits is essential in the case of drunkards"—He then addresses himself to a calm exposure of Mr. Stanley's mistakes.

THE REMARKS CANVASSED, &c.

The small Tract, from the pen of the Rev. Jacob Stanley, referred to in the title page, professes to be "Remarks" on Two Pamphlets published by Mr. Charleston of Bristol, and the Rev. W. H. Turner, Vicar of Banwell, in reply to Mr. S's original production. In the rejoinder, these replies are, of course, thought to be anything but a successful refutation of the objections advanced against the system which forms the subject of the controversy. The public however will judge, which of the contending parties, has the best of the argument in their favour.

My object is to examine certain statements in Mr. S's latter publication, which bear more or less upon the question of total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks, avoiding all remarks upon the parties themselves, who are mixed up in the discussion. Mr. S's pamphlet, defensive as it is, of his former publication, contains matter for serious objection; and those who differ from him in opinion, will think it the duty of some one of their number to reply. I have taken this task upon myself, for a reason which I think quite satisfactory, namely, that I am already in the field upon the subject, with the Rev. Author, and may therefore be considered, a proper person to proceed with the enquiry. I trust what I am about to advance, will be the means of assisting the cause, the interests of which, I am anxious to promote.

Passing over two or three introductory paragraphs, I find that Mr. S. repeats what he had formerly said, "that the teetotallers have discovered a more effectual remedy for the cure of moral evil, than our LORD ever discovered," and adds, "Is not this what teetotallers affirm, and what Mr. Charleton himself affirms?" This, I think, is putting the matter very unfairly before the public. Mr. C. or any other Total Abstinence might have been an infidel, and as such, would certainly think, that Total Abstinence was a more effectual remedy for drunkenness than the preaching of the Gospel. But the society which advocates abstinence principles, is wronged by being placed in any such invidious position. Total Abstinence from all intoxicating drinks, is known to be a remedy for drunkenness, and as such is advocated; but the existence of a society formed on such principles, ought not to be supposed a reflection upon the Gospel, which seeks the same object on higher grounds, and from nobler motives. Mr. S. has, therefore, put language into the mouth of Total Abstinence, which they do not use, and then given a character to that language which, whether true or false, is altogether inapplicable to them. "Infidels and ungodly men," says Mr. S. "is the character of many of the teetotallers;" but that is not the character in which they are recognized in their associated capacity, any more than others of religious principle and profession, are acknowledged in their religious character. The society, like any other organization, looks at its members not as infidels or religionists, but as Total Abstinence, which is their proper designation. It is also unfair to say, because some of the disciples of Robert Owen may be Total Abstinence, that therefore, Total Abstinence is comprehended "in the plans of the followers of that maniac." I had always understood, that conviviality and mirth, were the order of the day among the Socialists; but if some of them are coming to a better mind on the subject of revelry and drunkenness, and are practising abstinence in their place, the fact of their being Abstinence, is not their fault, but the infidelity which asserts that this is all they need, and which denies the reality and indispensableness of religion.

The observations on the union of Total Abstinence with American Slavery, contained in the original pamphlet, are attempted to be defended in these "Remarks," but the attempt I will venture to affirm is a complete failure. Who would imagine, that because things were "co-existent," they were therefore amalgamated? And yet, it would seem, this is the reasoning which Mr. S. adopts, for when he would prove a "union," he says, "All that I affirm is, that Slavery and teetotalism are co-existent in America." Yes truly, but the same parties may uphold Slavery which is wrong, and Total Abstinence which in other eyes than those of Mr. S. is perfectly right and proper, especially when such abstinence is practised with a view to prevent or to remove intemperate excess. Mr. S. might as well have asserted a union between Slavery and Methodism in the West Indies, while they co-existed, as between Total Abstinence and Slavery in America. The circumstance of my being a Pro-slavery man, any more than my being an Anti-slavery man, does not at all affect my membership with the Total Abstinence Society, and if a union is to be argued, it is only fair that the union should be on the side of the Abolitionists, who form the larger number of Total Abstainers, as Mr. C. affirms, and Mr. S. does not offer to deny.

The tale of the butter-milk is most tenaciously adhered to, as if to make the society appear ridiculous, was Mr. S's only aim; but the introduction of such a circumstance, I think, is perfectly unworthy of the controversy. It may or may not have been the case, that butter-milk was used on a sacramental occasion; but even if this were the fact, the society is not to be implicated in the folly. The Total Abstinence Association says, Don't drink wine or any other intoxicating drink as a beverage; and if some are extravagant enough to urge the principle of abstinence from its use, at the table of the Lord, the society ought not to be blamed, since it avowedly does not interfere with its use in a religious ordinance. The other absurdities also, need not to have been introduced, for they are not the doings of the Society, but of individuals who suffered their zeal to outstep the bounds of

reason and propriety. Mr. S. would not like all the silly things which have been said and done by ignorant Methodists, to be fathered on the great Connexion of which he is an able and distinguished minister. Yet this would be quite as proper, as to conclude that the Total Abstinence Society is wrong, because foolish things have been said and done by many of its members. The Rev. G. B. Macdonald has very properly remarked, in his sermon on "Christian Obligations as to abstaining from intoxicating drinks;" preached on the second Anniversary of the British and Foreign Society for the Suppression of Intemperance, "All that we ask is a fair examination of our officially published and avowed principles, motives, and records. We think that in common justice and honesty, we ought to be judged by our *authorized publications and acts*, and not by any individual's sayings and doings. This mode of deciding upon the doctrinal views and religious habits of the varied sections of the Church of Christ, is conceded by common consent. I, for one, as a Wesleyan, should most strenuously object to have my creed and manner of speaking on divine subjects, judged of, by the somewhat singular statements to which I have listened from the lips of pious, but profoundly ignorant and uncouth, and, in some instances, eccentric persons belonging to the same Christian Church that I do. When taunted by the quotation of some folly or absurdity which may have been uttered under such circumstances, I throw myself back upon our accredited publications, and officially declared views of doctrine; and I feel justified in such a mode of defence. I ask, on this principle, for even handed justice to the friends of the temperance cause." As to what Mr. S. says about the world being made "on teetotal principles," it is altogether wide of the question. Must it again and again be affirmed that the society quarrels not with the things themselves (though some of its members do) but with their abuse? To prevent the abuse by others, the sober christian declines altogether what he can very well do without, that he may give an example of entire abstinence, which is the only safety of the intemperate. The parallel sought to be

run between the rejection of the Gospel, and the rejection of stimulating drinks, both represented as blessings from God, will not hold good, because the rejection of the Gospel would be fatal to the soul, whereas the rejection of stimulating drinks would not be followed by such consequences, but might, on the contrary, be a means of bringing those who had been intemperate, to think of the evil of their doings, and to seek and find forgiveness of their sins. Pious Total Abstiners hope never to be ungrateful for the bounties of Providence : but they would learn, at the same time, to discriminate between what they might lawfully and gratefully use, and what considerations of a moral nature should lead them to decline.

The "Remarks" on Mr. C's zeal and its supposed effects, might have been well spared. I thought his pamphlet a truly christian and temperate address ; and I have no reason to think otherwise from any thing that Mr. S. has advanced. I do suspect however, that so much cannot be said of the animadversions to which it has given rise. It appears to me that the anger and irritation are with Mr. S. and not with Mr. C. ; and if so, then this "affords strong presumptive proof that (opposition to) teetotalism is not of God." These observations, which are somewhat personal, would not have been made, but that the "Remarks" which originated them, were intended to stab the cause through the medium of its advocate. Hence the assertion "that there seems to be something in teetotalism which spoils the best of tempers, and which generally produces angry feelings in its subjects, against all who have the temerity to question its truth." There is one however whose temper has not been so spoiled ; for of his other opponent Mr. S. says, "Teetotalism has shed no baneful influence upon him, for his letter breathes the spirit of the gentleman and the christian." I wonder that this instance did not in Mr. S's opinion, rescue the society from its supposed disgrace, and help him to the more correct conclusion that if improper dispositions are displayed, the fault is not in the system but in the man.

Mr. Turner's "Letter" is noticed as containing "as much in favour of teetotalism as can well be said, but"

adds Mr. S. "more must be said before 'Teetotalism calmly considered is answered.'" It seems then, that something, however inconsiderable, may be said in favour of total abstinence; and this avowal from the pen of Mr. S. is a somewhat extraordinary concession. After all, it was "the love of brevity," that prevented Mr. T. from saying much more that might have been said; and yet there needed not to be any thing added, fully to confute Mr. S's reasoning. He still insists on the necessity of total abstinence in the case of drunkards, and lest he should be misapprehended, cautiously states his meaning in a note below. "I do not mean," he says, "that persons who are really converted to God, should totally abstain. These have a moral power to use without abusing the gifts of Providence. But where there is no change of heart, the only safety for the drunkard is in total abstinence." This is certainly a very singular statement to proceed from Mr. S. who is so averse to abstinence, as distinguished from what he calls "temperance" principles. So then total abstinence must first be brought to bear upon a drunkard, as nothing else will do; but no sooner is the drunkard reformed and converted, than he is allowed to take moderately, the intoxicating beverage, since he has now "a moral power to use without abusing the gifts of Providence"! But did it never occur to Mr. S. that such moral power has been often abused, even by a really converted individual? That which has been his besetting sin before his conversion, will be his snare after his conversion; and then comes in the doctrine of the Apostle, "Let us lay aside every weight, *and the sin which doth so easily beset us.*"

Mr. S. seems chafed that it should be said—and well he might, for it is a serious charge—that a reformed drunkard had relapsed into his former habits of intoxication, through reading his pamphlet, and says in reply, it is "impossible and false." He even thinks it as "utterly incredible," and as "morally impossible," as for such a case to occur, simply from reading the Bible, or listening to the speech of the Rev. G. B. Macdonald, who mentioned the circumstance in his address delivered at the last An-

nual Meeting of the Abstinence Society, held in Exeter Hall. I however think differently. Here is a drunkard whose reformation is brought about by total abstinence agency. Nothing else would do, nothing less would have been available. Mr. S. allows in such a case a moderate use of alcoholic drinks. Mr. M. does not. If the individual is influenced by Mr. M's arguments, his reformation is secured. If, on the contrary, he is influenced by Mr. S's reasonings, he gives up his total abstinence practice, takes a little, and through the force of habit and the power of temptation into which he has entered, resigns himself to the fascination of the fatal cup, and is easily overcome. This is no hypothetical case, as many apostate abstainers can testify; and therefore the only safety of a reclaimed drunkard, lies in the fact that he *tastes not*.

When Mr. S. concludes that the arguments he has advanced against total abstinence, are not met by Mr. T., merely because the Rev. Vicar "entertains no doubt as to the intoxicating nature of the wines mentioned in scripture," he egregiously mistakes. Arguments founded upon the considerations adduced, are not arguments against the principle of total abstinence rightly understood, but against the views of those who think that intoxicating beverages, are in themselves unscriptural and sinful. Total abstinence may be maintained, and yet the considerations themselves remain unanswerably true.

Mr. S. asks for an explanation on total abstinence principles, of "the conduct of our Redeemer in not furnishing an example of total abstinence," and says, "The absence of his example in favour of total abstinence is utterly fatal to teetotalism." I think not. His conduct will admit of a consistent explanation, without coming to such a conclusion. To the objection thus urged, I would give briefly the following replies.

1. Christ came to establish *Christianity itself*, and not to originate a series of agencies and instruments, for the more effectual diffusion of his own heavenly religion amongst mankind. He said to his disciples "Go and preach the Gospel to every creature;" but this is done by means of various societies, which directly or indirectly bear

on the conversion of the world. Amongst these, the Temperance Society tenders its aid, and though but of comparatively recent formation, has not been the least useful towards the promotion of the common object.

2. Drunkenness, it would seem, was not so *awfully prevalent* an evil in the primitive times of christianity as it is at present, not only in our own country, but in almost all parts of the civilized world. I think this may be reasonably inferred from the Apostolic statement, "They that be drunken are drunken in the night," which seems to suggest that drunkenness was not so commonly practised, and did not assume that boldness and daring which now almost universally characterizes it. The drunkard anciently did not dare to stalk forth in open day, but hid himself under covert of the night, ashamed of his conduct, and of the unseemly condition to which it reduced him. Dr. Adam Clarke, in a note upon this text, remarks, "It was accounted doubly scandalous, even among the heathen, to be drunk in the day-time." The same inference, of the milder character and infrequent occurrence of intemperance, may be deduced from St. Peter's words, who, in reply to the charge, "These men are full of new wine," retorted, "These men are not drunken, as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day." It may indeed be said, that the restriction applied only to an early period of the day, and that after nine o'clock in the morning, the Jews were left at liberty to drink freely, and even to excess. They were so; but we have no evidence to shew that intemperance so extensively prevailed in Judea, and marched through the land with such bold and daring effrontery, as it does in this country. Our Lord denounces almost every species of iniquity, and yet we never read of his addressing and reproving a company of drunkards. His presence at the marriage of Cana in Galilee, where he supernaturally countenanced the drinking of wine, is a proof that intoxicating habits were but very limitedly chargeable upon the Jews. Our inference therefore, from the preceding instances, is, that no such necessity then existed, as exists at present for *special* efforts on behalf of drunkards. Mr. Macdonald, addressing professors of

religion not abstainers, powerfully remarks, " Limited—conscientiously limited—as your use of alcoholic drinks may be, there are those who derive encouragement from your conduct to run into intemperance. I ask solemnly before God, if this fact can be made out, whether the time and the circumstances have not arrived in which it is clearly your duty to exercise christian self denial, and to renounce a personal gratification, which is positively injurious in its *effect*, since by indulging in it, you encourage many of your fellow creatures to form and strengthen habits of intemperance? Had there been an association formed, and promises made, and pledges taken, by the members of the Corinthian Church, that they would *abstain* from every thing which might prove a stumbling block to others, I believe St. Paul would have acknowledged that they were acting in perfect consistency with the principles which he himself laid down, and were only endeavouring to imitate the example which he had placed before them."

3. The example of Christ is not to be supposed *unfavourable* to total abstinence, merely because it does not *agree* with the principle. We can easily conceive of a difference which involves no opposition. Christ's example allows of moderate drinking, but his example does not oppose entire abstinence. To drink moderately, is a duty only as it is opposed to drinking immoderately; but not to drink at all, is plainly a duty, when drinking moderately uniformly leads to imtemperate excess. Besides, a strictly sober man may forego his right to drink moderately, for the sake of reclaiming others who drink immoderately, and not at all place himself in an antagonist position to the Saviour's example.

4. We argue, that though total abstinence from the use of all intoxicating drinks, is not actually enjoined in any one chapter or verse of scripture, yet the *whole spirit* of the New Testament enjoins it. Mr. M. from whom I have already quoted, says, " I meet with some well-meaning, though not over-wise persons, who in their simplicity, settle the matter thus summarily, ' Give us a *plain text of Scripture* for it, and we shall be satisfied?' When we

say, 'We have not one to advance,' the smile of triumph lights up their countenance, as though some very signal and important victory had been achieved. This objection sounds very speciously ; but I deny that it is, warranted, either by scripture or by common sense. I wish to submit this thought to your serious consideration, that *we do make a right use of scripture when we conscientiously apply its principles to investigate and direct the purposes and conduct of men.*" Mr. T. similarly argues, and as conclusively, with respect to the example of Christ, when he says, "Although the letter of the law cannot require the sober and religious teetotaller to deny himself what our Saviour's example has given him authority to use, still the spirit of it does, if the abuse of it is a stumbling block, or cause of offence, to a weak brother, and leads many to defeat the purpose for which the Saviour died, and actually to crucify the Son of God afresh.—None of these means (total abstinence societies) are commanded in scripture, none are enforced on us by the direct practice of Christ or his Apostles ; but I do not the less gather from the principles revealed to me in their writings, and developed in their characters, that it is my duty to support them." To this reasoning, so triumphant, it may not be unnecessary to add, that the example of Christ, and the example of total abstinence societies, though differing in themselves, are both opposed to habits of intemperance.

5. Mr. S. himself *invalidates* the objection he has urged, when he asserts the necessity of abstinence in certain cases. He asserts this not only in the case of the drunkard, who must not touch at all, or he will exceed the limits of moderation ; but also in the case of the sober christian, who may be placed in such circumstances that for the sake of others, he is bound by christian charity to refrain altogether, that they may be induced by his example to refrain also. When Mr. S. says, that Christ either did or did not know what influence example would have upon drunkards," and adds, "If he did know that example would cure (drunkenness,) and withheld that example, what are we to think of his hatred to the sin and

his love to the poor sinner"? he would insinuate that such example is powerless or it would have been adopted by Christ. But is not this to confront himself, since he admits the power of example in certain cases? Will Mr. S. then, place himself, under a certain class of circumstances, in direct opposition to the example of Christ? He would say, an *opposed*, but I would say, a *different* position, and with this distinction, there is nothing of blasphemy in the conduct or example of total abstiners.

When Mr. S. says that total abstinence is "a corruption of christian temperance, analagous to some of the corruptions of early christianity," he makes a statement which it would be impossible to prove. The total abstinence principle is not advocated for its own sake, but for the purpose of removing intemperance by an infallible remedy. "There is a completeness about the cure and prevention of intemperance, on the principles we advocate," says Mr. M. "which commends itself to the common sense of every unprejudiced mind. By absolutely refraining from all that can intoxicate, a man can neither remain a drunkard nor become one." It is found that allowable drinking is invariably abused in numerous cases and therefore to prevent the abuse; the Abstinence Society declines its use; knowing assuredly that such abuse can never proceed from the entire disuse of alcoholic drinks. If indeed temperance (applying that term to the moderate use of liquors that intoxicate) could be secured as effectually by other means, then such abstinence need not to be adopted. This is an *extreme* measure to which the friends of humanity have had recourse, making a *personal sacrifice*, if by such means, the crying evil of intemperance may be utterly removed. The quotation therefore, of Mr. S. from "a powerful living writer," is not at all to the purpose. We prefer abstinence to intemperance, and if the strictness of entire self-denial be not necessary *per se*, to those who know how to govern and subdue unlawful appetite; yet we will give up altogether what might be properly used, rather than withhold our aid from a perfectly innocent project to arrest the progress of intemperance in the land.

To the advice given to total abstiners by Mr. S. in his last eight lines, I heartily respond, and have no doubt it will generally be acted upon, though there may be exceptions amongst them as there are with their opponents. Insult is unbecoming any cause; and whether Mr. S. has been guilty of what he so strenuously denounces, I leave the readers of

his pamphlets to decide. After all, it looks something very like insult to charge Total Abstiners with substituting another gospel for that of Christ, when they have so repeatedly denied it. Mr. M. asks and remarks, "Are they jealous lest we should be attempting to supercede in the smallest degree the Gospel of Jesus Christ? We have replied, positively and unequivocally, in the negative. It is as ungenerous as it is unjust and false, to repeat the suspicion that some infidel design is lurking beneath our scheme, when we thus openly avow our object." As for the closing statement that "total abstinence leads to associations dangerous to the religion and morals of every good man, and especially so to those who are not rooted and grounded in the truth," it is sufficient to reply that it is utterly unfounded. The propriety of an association for such an object as that contemplated by total abstiners, though comprising in other respects both religious and irreligious persons, has been well stated by the author already largely cited, "We have been told that it is wrong for believers to associate together—much more so to fraternize with men, who, in some instances, make no profession of religion, in order to accomplish the object however good, that may be in itself, which we avow." Some have denied that it is lawful—I mean of course scripturally lawful;—others have affirmed that if lawful considered abstractedly, it is neither expedient nor necessary. I believe in my conscience and before God, that an association formed on the principle which we lay down, and for the object which we specify, is both lawful and expedient—the statute book of God, and the exigencies of the times deciding that point.—The conclusion to which I have come upon this entire question of association for certain religious or humane purposes is, *that scripture principles warrant christians to unite with every man, in every good work, so far as they can, without compromising truth, or aiding in the diffusion of error.*"

I have now done with Mr. S's last issue. I hope this and my former reply, may be considered a full answer to the objections he has advanced against the principle of total abstinence. Believing him perfectly sincere in his opposition to what he conceives to be a new thing under the sun, and consequently objectionable, because of its novelty; I should be sorry to suppose his intentions were any other than to scatter error, and to disseminate truth. With Mr. M. I would say, "I respect the jealousy and suspicion with which the church looks upon all novelties. So many heresies in doctrine, and inconsistencies, and immoralities in practice

have grown out of theories the most plausible, that I do not wonder some hesitancy should have been manifested on this question." But however pure may have been the motives from which he has acted, and however excellent the object at which he has aimed, I do solemnly believe, he has done more injury than service to the cause of Christ by his recent publications. I pray God not to lay this sin to his charge, and I hope the time will soon come when he will see with other eyes, and defend the system which he has hitherto thought proper to oppose.

EXTRACTS

FROM THE REV. J. WESLEY'S WORKS.

The following is taken from Mr. Wesley's Sermon on Public Diversions:—

"You see the wine when it sparkles in the cup, and are going to drink it: I tell you there is poison in it, and therefore beg you to throw it away. You answer, the wine is harmless in itself: I reply, perhaps it is so; but still, if it be mixed with what is *not harmless*, no one in his senses, if he knows it at least, unless he could separate the good from the bad, will once think of drinking it. If you add, it is not poison to me though it be to others,—then I say *throw it away for thy brother's sake*, lest thou embolden him to drink. Why should thy strength occasion thy weak brother to perish, for whom Christ died? Now let any one judge which is the uncharitable person, he who pleads against the wine, or the diversion, for his brother's sake; or he who pleads against the life of his brother, for the sake of the wine or the diversion."

The following is extracted from Mr. Wesley's Sermon on the Use of Money, where speaking of spirituous liquors, he says,—

"All who sell them in the common way, to any that will buy, are poisoners-general. They murder his Majesty's subjects by wholesale, neither do they ever pity or spare.—They drive them to HELL, like sheep: And what is their gain? Is it not the BLOOD of these men? Who then would envy their large estates and sumptuous palaces? A CURSE is in the midst of them: the CURSE of God cleaves to the stones, the timber, the furniture of them. The CURSE of

God is in their gardens, their walks, their groves, a fire that burns to the nethermost HELL. BLOOD, BLOOD is there: the foundation, the floor, the walls, the roof are stained with BLOOD! And canst thou hope, O man of BLOOD, though thou art "clothed in scarlet and fine linen, and farest sumptuously every day;" canst thou hope to deliver down the fields of blood to the third generation? Not so; for there is a God in heaven; therefore thy name shall be rooted out like as those whom thou hast destroyed, body and soul, "*thy memorial shall perish with thee.*"

The following Rule is taken from the Methodist class book;—All who continue Members of the Wesleyan Methodist Societies are expected to abstain from "Drunkenness; *buying or selling* spirituous liquors, or *drinking them*, unless in cases of *extreme necessity.*"

The following is taken from the Preface to Mr. Wesley's Primitive Physic;—

"Water is the most wholesome of all drinks; it quickens the appetite, and strengthens the digestion most. Strong, and more especially, spirituous liquors are a certain, though slow poison. Experience shows there is very seldom any danger in leaving them off all at once. Strong liquors do not prevent the mischiefs of a surfeit, nor carry it off so safely as water."

FINIS.

THEW, PRINTER, LYNN.